

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

THADDEUS TYSON MANN,

Plaintiff,

v.

MINERAL COUNTY DETENTION
CENTER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:24-cv-00560-MMD-CSD

ORDER

Plaintiff Thaddeus Tyson Mann brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while incarcerated at Mineral County Detention Center. (ECF No. 1-1.) On December 27, 2024, this Court ordered Mann to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$405 filing fee on or before February 28, 2025. (ECF No. 4.) The Court warned Mann that the action could be dismissed if he failed to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with all three documents or pay the full \$405 filing fee for a civil action by that deadline. (*Id.* at 2.) The Court's order came back as undeliverable to the address that Mann provided to the Court. (*Id.* at 5.) The deadline to file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the \$405 filing fee has passed, and Mann did not file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, pay the full \$405 filing fee, or file an updated address with the Court.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party's failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. See *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir.

1 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to
2 keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th
3 Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining
4 whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the
5 public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to manage its
6 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition
7 of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. See *In re*
8 *Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting
9 *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

10 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation
11 and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of Mann's
12 claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal
13 because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing
14 a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542
15 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of
16 cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

17 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can
18 be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the Court's need to consider
19 dismissal. See *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining
20 that considering less drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order
21 does not satisfy this factor); accord *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th
22 Cir. 2002) (explaining that “the persuasive force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that
23 “implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic alternatives prior to disobedience of the court's
24 order as satisfying this element[.]” *i.e.*, like the “initial granting of leave to amend coupled
25 with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[.]” have been “eroded” by *Yourish*).
26 Courts “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a
27 case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives.” *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779
28 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed until and

1 unless Mann either files a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pays
2 the \$405 filing fee for a civil action, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting
3 another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only delays
4 the inevitable and squanders the Court's finite resources. The circumstances here do not
5 indicate that this case will be an exception: because Mann's mail from the Court is being
6 returned as undeliverable, it is unlikely that a second order would even reach him. Setting
7 another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth
8 factor favors dismissal.

9 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that they
10 weigh in favor of dismissal. It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without
11 prejudice based on Mann's failure to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma*
12 *pauperis* or pay the full \$405 filing fee in compliance with this Court's December 27, 2024,
13 order. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.
14 No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If Mann wishes to pursue his
15 claims, he must file a complaint in a new case.

16 DATED THIS 7th Day of March 2025.

17
18 

19 _____
20 MIRANDA M. DU
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28